

THE REMONSTRANCE AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1914

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women

Ninety-nine Branch Committees; 26,011* members in 396 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, President.
MISS MARY S. AMES.
MRS. JOHN BALCH.
MISS ANNA L. DAWES.
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD.
MISS AGNES IRWIN.
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL.
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY.
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
pro tem., Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS E. C. POST, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Vice-Presidents

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age, eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

SUFFRAGE AND THE BABIES

THE call for contributions to the suffrage "melting-pot" contained the following appeal:

"Among your personal possessions there is something you can give, something you can consecrate, perhaps a little silver cup kept for love of some child. Every three minutes, a baby dies in this land of ours from some preventable disease or from improper food. Give the little cup, that the mother wisdom of the country may express itself directly through wise, sane laws for the good of children."

This is touching. But how is "the mother wisdom" of the country expressing itself in suffrage states? How does it happen that there are better child labor laws in male-suf-

frage states than in suffrage states? And, apropos of this matter of improper food for babies, what are we to say of this extract from a letter by Mr. Nathan Straus in the Los Angeles Times of March 24, 1914?

"Other states and countries have adopted wise and judicious laws to prevent the spread of diseased animals and the sale of milk from infected cows. California is one of the few states which still permit the sale of milk from tubercular cows."

Suppose that Dr. Shaw and the other signers of the "melting-pot" appeal, instead of trying to use infant mortality as suffrage campaign material, were to try to secure decent sanitary legislation in California and other suffrage states. Would it not be a good expression of "mother wisdom"? And would it not be a great deal more useful to the community and a great deal more sincere?

WHY WOMEN OPPOSE WOMAN SUFFRAGE

THOUGHTFUL women realize that voting is less a privilege than a responsibility. To vote as good citizens ought to vote requires time and strength which the average woman can ill spare from her normal activities. She cannot take on man's job without slighting her own.

Women are not in the habit of shirking. If they were convinced that their use of the ballot would be a benefit to the state, they would take up the new responsibility courageously. But this is precisely what has never been proved. Suffragists, it is true, go on making reckless promises. But when asked for actual proof, more and more they follow Judge Lindsey in admitting that "women are as free of the power of the Beast as men are,—and no freer," and Professor Max Eastman

in regarding the claim that woman's vote will purify the political arena as pure sentimentality.

When leading suffragists admit that women will divide at the polls pretty much as men do, the argument that women ought to assume the suffrage for the good of society vanishes. The suffragists are actually asking women to add the responsibility of the ballot to those they are already carrying for no better reason than that a small but very noisy minority of women want it. The claims of the woman of the home, the woman of large philanthropic activities, are to be set aside, if the suffragists have their way, at the demand of the woman of cross-country "hikes," of spectacular street parades and of soap-box oratory. To such lengths has this disregard of the interests and wishes of the great majority been carried that it is now boldly affirmed that, if only one woman in any state wants to vote, she should be given the "right."

Women oppose woman suffrage also because, so far from being a movement of "progress," it is a step backward toward the days when little or no discrimination was made in favor of women in the distribution of the burdens of society. It has been well said that, the farther we get from savagery, the more marked is the disposition among men to relieve women of the harder work and to shield them from the rougher experiences of life. The suffrage movement urges women to ignore all differences of function and powers, and to relinquish the privileges and exemptions which an advancing civilization has given them in order that they may engage in a futile struggle for "equality" in alien fields of politics and public life. At a time

when specialization is increasingly recognized as a prime factor of efficiency, the suffrage movement proposes that it shall be ignored where it is most important and fundamental.

Another reason why women oppose woman suffrage is that, the moment they enter the field of politics, they forfeit the unique influence which they now possess by reason of their non-partisanship. Under present conditions, if women seek to better laws, they make their appeal to voters or legislators simply as individuals with the good of society at heart, and with no personal or political interests to serve. But, when they are voters and members of a political party, their influence is limited to the party to which they belong. They make their appeal as Republicans or Democrats or Progressives. They may or may not carry their own party with them; but they can look for no favors from the other parties, and men who might have helped them under other conditions will not do so when a rival party is to get the credit of it. This is one reason why the best laws for the protection of women and children are to be found, not in suffrage states, but in male-suffrage states.

It is not the suffragists, but the women who oppose woman suffrage, who really stand for "woman's rights." They stand for the right of women to exercise the freest, widest and most healthful influence for the good of the community.

NOT SO VERY DEMOCRATIC

THE suffrage movement professes to be especially "democratic" and to stand for the interests of the People, with a capital P.

But one of its best-known leaders, Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, writing in the *North American Review*, forgets to maintain this profession. Advocating zealously the proposed constitutional amendment to confer full suffrage upon women throughout the United States, she describes it as

"an intolerable situation" that women should have to try to get the suffrage by having state constitutions amended, and argues that, from the time a National amendment is submitted, "women are freed from the humiliation of personal appeals to the individual voters and can concentrate their efforts on the Legislatures." In the legislatures, she goes on to say, the "lowest" type of citizens are not often found; and when legislators show themselves hostile "they could possibly be relegated to private life." Therefore, no man "who possesses the true spirit of chivalry" should want to subject women "to the publicity, toil and sacrifice of a State campaign when there is an easier, speedier and more dignified method."

In other words, it is easier to threaten and heckle individual members of a legislature than it is to persuade a majority of the voters to approve of a suffrage amendment. That may be conceded. But, whatever may be said of this argument from the point of view of practical politics, it exhibits the suffragists, not as supporters of democratic ideals, but as anxious to get as far away as possible from the people. It is a "humiliation" to appeal to the voters at large; but it is "an enormous advantage" to be able instead to manipulate legislators.

DRAWING THE LINE

AN argument often brought forward by the Suffragist with a triumphant air of finality is that woman suffrage is "the next step in woman's progress," that it is "the logical consequence of woman's education," and that "the consistent thinker must favor it." "If woman was not to have the ballot," says the Suffragist, "she ought never to have been taught the alphabet. There's no place to draw the line."

Let us see how this battery works when the Feminist turns it against the Suffragist.

When Teresa Billington-Greig re-

monstrates against the "narrowing of the whole feminist movement to the mere demand for the vote" and urges that "full economic opportunity for women" must be "antagonistic to wife-maintenance," does the Suffragist take Mrs. Billington-Greig's next step and accept "the burden of economic independence"? Not at all. She draws the line.

When Miss Margaret Ladd Franklin asserts that "perhaps the chief thing to be said for suffrage is precisely that it will make woman less womanly, in the commonly accepted sense of the term," and that "one cannot argue logically on woman suffrage without facing this fact," does the Suffragist face the fact? Certainly not. She draws the line.

When the Feminists whom Ellen Key quotes in her latest book claim that "the liberated personality must place the obligations of the intellect above those of the family life," does the Suffragist's liberated personality at once begin to place them so? By no means. She draws the line.

When Mr. G. Bernard Shaw characterizes "the right to bear a child" as "perhaps the most sacred of woman's rights," pronounces that "it should not have any conditions attached to it, save in the interests of race welfare," and asks "Why should the taking of a husband be imposed as the price of maternity?" does the Suffragist follow him? Indeed, no. She draws the line.

Drawing the line is one of the normal, everyday activities of the healthy mind. The Suffragist—the conservative old-school Suffragist—draws it this side of unmarried motherhood and economic independence. The Anti-suffragist draws it this side the ballot-box.

THE National American Woman Suffrage Association proposes to "blacklist" a selected group of Senators and Representatives; the Congressional Union advertises its purpose to blacklist all the Democratic candidates for Congress in the nine suffrage states. Some of them are ardent suffragists, but they are all to be offered up impartially. It is an amusing threat, but little is likely to come of it.

NO EXCUSE FOR MILITANCY

AMERICAN apologists for English militancy are in the habit of excusing it on the ground of the extreme injustice which women suffer under English laws.

On the authority of Mr. Alexander Wemyss Samuel, an English lawyer, writing in the *New York World* for June 28, it may be stated that, with a single exception, the laws of England relating to women are substantially the same as in this country, and where they discriminate it is always in favor of women. So eminent an authority as Earl Loreburn, Lord High Chancellor of England for 1905-1912, declares: "Taken as a whole, our laws are more merciful to women than to men, and are more mercifully administered toward women than toward men."

Under English law, the father and not the mother is responsible for the maintenance and care of the children. He is the legal guardian: she the domestic guardian. If he fails to provide for the education and maintenance of his children, he may be sent to prison. But the wife has no responsibility, and even if she has large private means not one cent of her income can be attached to maintain her children if her husband is alive and able to work. The wife, however large her means, can never be compelled to support her husband. If he should fall sick and be unable to support himself the wife may turn him out of her house; and the most that she can be required to do is to pay the poor authorities for his maintenance as a pauper. A man may not will all of his money away from his wife and children; but a woman may will her money absolutely as she chooses. A man is responsible for his wife's reasonable expenditures for clothes, etc., but, however large her income, she is not responsible for his. A wife cannot be indicted for a crime which she commits in the presence of her husband: she is held to have committed

it under duress. No action can be brought against a wife for slander or libel: it must be brought against the husband, and the fact that she has large means makes no difference.

So nearly complete is the protection of women in both property and person under English law that Sir Edward Clarke, K. C., a great legal authority, challenged the suffragists to state a single law which they desired to have amended or passed, for which they could not get a hearing because they had no votes, and offered a large sum to a charity if proved, but no claim was put forward.

The only inequality of which English women may justly complain is the provision of the divorce laws which makes it necessary for a husband to prove only the adultery of his wife to secure divorce, while the wife must prove in addition either "cruelty" or "desertion." But this apparent inequality is usually rectified in actual divorce practice, the courts being inclined to give a liberal interpretation to the word "cruelty," reckoning the mental suffering experienced through harsh words or a violent temper as sufficient evidence of cruelty.

However much this single inequality may be magnified or distorted, it furnishes a very meagre excuse for the violence and destructiveness of the militants.

NEBRASKA AND COLORADO

THE Nebraska State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has prepared an argument against suffrage which will be printed in the state's pamphlet which is to be mailed, under the referendum law, to the 255,000 voters of the state.

One of the most effective points in the argument is a comparison of the laws of Nebraska and Colorado. The laws for wage-earning women are better in Nebraska than in Colorado. Under the Colorado eight-hour law, a woman may be compelled to work eight hours a day for seven days, and the work may be

done at night. Under the Nebraska nine-hour law, women cannot be required to work more than 54 hours a week, and night work is absolutely prohibited. The child-labor laws of Nebraska are more far-reaching than those of Colorado; wages for women are as good in Nebraska as in Colorado, and the laws for property-owning women are better.

In a word, practically all that the suffragists boast of in Colorado as the fruit of women's votes has been done earlier, better and more thoroughly in Nebraska without women's votes. These facts are likely to be remembered by the voters of that state next month.

A PROTEST FROM NEVADA

THE Nevada Association of Women Opposed to Equal Suffrage sent a vigorous protest to President Wilson last July against the proposed Federal suffrage amendment.

The particular occasion for the protest was the sending of a petition "in the name of the women of Nevada," urging the President to advocate the suffrage amendment. This petition, it was stated, bore the signatures of "more than 500 women." A petition similarly phrased and with the same signatures was sent to Congress. The Nevada protest said:

"There are more than 17,000 white women in Nevada over the age of 21 years. Less than 1 in 34 have petitioned Congress, and we deny the right of these 500 women to speak for the 17,000, or the right of 1 in 34 to speak, without consent, for the other 33 on a subject so vitally affecting the State, the family and the home.

We deny that either the right of franchise or the equality of franchise is an inherent right or that any government has so treated it. Few governments have even uniformity of franchise in either sex or as between sexes. Congress is asked by 1 in 34 of the women of Nevada to enlist the power of the other 47 states to enfranchise and 'emancipate' the entire 17,000 women of this State, while 103,761 men and 116,148 women over the age of 21 years in the District of Columbia look on and

continue to be taxed without protest on four times the valuation of Nevada and live in 'bondage' without even a vote for school trustee or an expressed desire for one."

SUFFRAGE AND THE SALOONS

THERE is still a good deal of misunderstanding, and a good deal of active misrepresentation with reference to the relation of the suffrage movement to the saloon interests.

Many people who recall the early identification of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union with the suffrage cause and who do not realize the change in suffrage leadership which has taken place during the last ten years assume that giving women the ballot will promote the interests of temperance and the restriction of the liquor traffic.

The suffragists themselves, when it suits their purpose, make this claim. If their attention is called to such incidents as the Los Angeles election in which the "wet" majority was heavily increased by the women's vote, or the women's soap-box campaign at Redondo Beach in the interest of the saloons, or the election at Santa Monica, where a large majority of the women voted for "wet" Sundays, they insist that these are only scattered instances, which may be explained by local conditions, and that the general trend of the suffrage movement is on the side of temperance. They point to Colorado, which has 92 per cent of its area under no-license, and to Illinois, where they claim that hundreds of saloons have been closed through women's votes.

But, while an unusually large percentage of the area of Colorado is "dry," the percentage of the population living in "dry" area is actually smaller than in neighboring man-suffrage states. In Colorado, only 54 per cent of the population lives in no-license area. But in Indiana, 65 per cent of the population is in "dry" territory, in Iowa, 79 per cent, and in Kentucky,—a state not generally credited with pronounced

temperance tendencies,—75 per cent. As to Illinois, the no-license gains in that state, to which the women's vote contributed, are a part of a general movement in that direction which was nearly, if not quite as successful in Minnesota, a man-suffrage state.

There is another general movement to be considered in this connection, which has large significance. This is the movement toward the development of the woman politician, concerned only with results and not in the least particular as to methods. In communities where the temperance sentiment is strong, the suffrage politician exerts herself to conciliate it. But, where the saloon interests are strong, the suffrage politician does her best to reassure them. Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict, who managed the suffrage campaign in Wisconsin, said, after it was over: "The brewers in Wisconsin gave us, so far as we know, a perfectly square deal." And the Michigan Equal Suffrage Association, in the course of the campaign in that state, published the following definite disclaimer: "Our Association has had no connection with the W. C. T. U., and we are not responsible for what the W. C. T. U. says or does. *The temperance issue has nothing to do with woman suffrage.*"

The same policy has been followed in this year's campaigns. Margaret Foley, speaking at street corners in New Bedford and elsewhere in this state, has pointed to the fact that no woman suffrage state has adopted prohibition, not regretfully or apologetically, but as proof that the saloons have nothing to fear from suffrage. The Nevada Equal Suffrage Society has issued an official statement, declaring that it has "no quarrel with the existing order of things, saloon or otherwise" and that "some of the men interested in the saloon business have shown us not only the greatest courtesy, but have helped us in various ways"; and adding:

"If the persons who circulated these stories will look up the history of the states which have given women the ballot, we think they will find they are not any 'dryer' than they were before. Utah and Colorado, where women have voted for years, are not prohibition states. San Francisco voted on the liquor question last year, after women were admitted to the polls, and went 'wet' by a large majority. We could cite many more examples if we had time and space. All we ask is the truth. Give us a square deal."

In like manner, Miss Elizabeth J. Hauser, state organizer for the suffragists of Ohio, has publicly declared that "there is no alliance between the Ohio Woman Suffrage Association and the Anti-Saloon League." And Dr. Anna Shaw has thought it wise to disclaim all connection between suffrage and prohibition in a widely-circulated statement, in which she says:

"The suffrage associations of the United States have never taken any stand upon the question of government control of the liquor traffic. . . . Just what the position of women voters upon the liquor problem will be has never been guessed, much less stated, by suffrage associations. The opinions of individual suffragists are as varied as are those of an equal number of anti-suffragists."

This official utterance does not encourage the expectation that woman suffrage will strengthen the cause of prohibition. That, as a matter of fact, it does not do so, is definitely stated by Judge Lindsey. In an interview in the Boston Post of July 26, Judge Lindsey said:

"Here is another point in which men are mistaken. They believe, most of them, down in their hearts, that women would at once close up the saloons. That is absolutely disproved by what has happened in Colorado. Colorado is a wet state, and Denver is a decidedly wet city. The wets won in Colorado last year with women voting. Women—good women—got out and worked for the wets. Thus you have Colorado with equal suffrage going wet by 50,000, while West Virginia, where the women can't vote, goes dry by 100,000."

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

THE First Chamber of the Swedish Diet, August 22, rejected the woman suffrage bill, upon which the Second Chamber had voted favorably.

NEITHER the Democratic nor the Republican state convention in Nebraska allowed itself to be cajoled into endorsing the pending suffrage amendment.

THE suffragist feud shows no signs of abating. Dr. Shaw describes the Congressional Union as "a comparatively small organization, unworthy of the favorable publicity given to it" and "a little handful of women, banded together to carry out the policies of Miss Alice Paul" and she says that they have put back the suffrage cause "fully five years." That is a moderate estimate.

REPRESENTATIVE LENROOT of Wisconsin, himself an ardent suffragist, tells the suffragists plainly that their tactics at Washington have been a grave mistake. "Repeated marching parades, and visiting members of Congress every few days by delegations of suffragists accomplished nothing," he says, and have been "hurtful to their cause rather than helpful." And he adds: "Men interested in a given policy would not advance that policy by repeated marchings up and down Pennsylvania Avenue."

DR. SHAW promises that "women will get the same pay as men for the same work as soon as they get the vote." But, if Dr. Shaw wants to be taken seriously, she should explain why this is not true in suffrage states. In Wyoming, after forty-four years of "votes for women," the average pay of women teachers is \$53.05 a month as compared with an average of \$85.26 for men teachers. This is a much greater difference than is found in such male-suffrage states as Maine, Virginia, Indiana and Missouri. In Utah, after eighteen years of woman suffrage, the

average monthly pay of women teachers is but \$53.60, while the average for men is \$77.32. In Colorado, the same conditions hold true. Such facts as these outweigh the rash suffrage promises.

IF the Attorney-General of Nebraska had intended that the voters of that state should vote in the dark on the proposed suffrage amendment, he could hardly have phrased the proposal more blindly. The line on the ballot makes no mention of woman suffrage, but merely informs the voters that they are to vote for or against an amendment "relating to electors." The state anti-suffrage association protested against this obscure phrasing, but as they had no notice of the attorney-general's proceeding until after the ten days allowed for protest under the law, their objection was futile.

ONE would think that even the most extreme suffragists would hesitate about trying to make campaign capital out of such a crisis as the world is just experiencing. But, no. Here is Miss Alice Carpenter saying that "the reason so many men were fighting and being killed in Europe was that women had no voice in the government." And here is Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt insisting that "this war should be a good argument for suffrage" and explaining that she felt that "if women had had the vote in all the countries now at war the conflict would have been prevented." It would be a waste of time to discuss such statements seriously but they serve as fair specimens of absurd suffrage claims.

IT is a favorite argument with the suffragists that woman suffrage must have worked well in the states which have tried it, else the neighboring states would not have adopted it. But the argument might be reversed. If the suffrage states are contiguous, so are the male-suffrage states; and it might be said that the voters of Wisconsin, Michigan and Ohio defeated suffrage by

heavy majorities because they saw things going extremely well in contiguous male-suffrage states. Suffrage has spread to certain states contiguous to earlier suffrage states, not because of demonstrated benefits from suffrage, but because of similar conditions of sparsely settled territory, the absence of large cities, and a considerable preponderance of males in the population.

"MOTHERING THE COMMUNITY"

IT is a favorite argument with suffragists that women, by keener insight, higher standards, steadier devotion to duty, and superior practical ability, would effect civic reforms which have been neglected by men. We hear over and over again that "woman is an adept at house-cleaning" and that "city government is nothing but municipal house-cleaning"; that "the community is only a larger home," and that "it needs mothering."

It would be pleasant to share this confidence in the present achievement of our sex, and to feel that it was ready for more worlds to conquer. But the facts do not point that way. One after another, social experts, the country over, are voicing the conviction that the individual home is not being "mothered" as it should be, and that faults there are responsible for much of the evil of the community.

Speaking of wife-desertion—one of the evils which suffragists hope to check by women's votes—Mrs. Catherine Van Wyck, President of the Wisconsin State Conference on Charities and Corrections—said, last fall: "Some of the homes I have seen almost justify the husband in running away from them. The wife who does not know her job must take her share of the blame for many cases of wife-desertion." Upon this same point, Miss Lucy Wheelock, the well-known educator, has said: "No business is so poorly and inefficiently conducted as that of housekeeping. To the luxury and inefficiency of the modern household, many economists charge the high

cost of living. They are not far wrong. At least they are right enough to make it imperative that we give our girls good and thorough training in all the craft of home-making and housekeeping."

Juvenile courts, the suffragists claim, would be reenforced in their work if women could vote. But Mrs. Fred T. Dubois, President of the Big Brother and Sister movement, though in close sympathy with these courts, writes to the Washington Times of June 12, to emphasize the need of urgent measures of prevention, before boys and girls reach the stage of juvenile crime. "Can you make human nature good through law?" asks Mrs. Dubois. "Is the old-fashioned home disappearing? I tremble at the thought. But when we watch the crowds upon the streets, day and night, the crowded cafes and restaurants, the dance-halls, moving-picture shows and theatres, this thought is uppermost: To what are we trending? The social centre is gradually going to take the place of the home, if we are not watchful. For we are trending toward the community life in this country. Can we become as strong a nation built of large units as of small ones well modelled? The community must grow out of the home."

The public teaching of sex-hygiene is another subject in which the suffragists believe women voters would take keen interest. But here, again, experts are pronouncing women unequal to the opportunities they already have. Mr. Graves Moore of the Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago, reporting last March on the work of the association in classifying causes in the cases of 500 unmarried mothers, said: "We find that more than half of them come from homes where there is no financial pressure, but that they never had presented to them the essential facts of life." Dr. Charles H. Keene of Minneapolis, a supervisor of hygiene and physical training, said at the recent

meeting of the National Educational Association: "We should have but the strongest contempt for the wealthy, club-going woman who has not time to teach her child the fundamental truths of life, and would throw the responsibility upon a teacher or a football coach. Such shiftlessness is outrageous." Dr. E. P. Colby, professor of nervous diseases in Boston University, said before a Ford Hall audience, last winter: "The proper place for such teaching is the home. But how many mothers are capable of instructing their daughters in such matters? Probably not one half."

Speaking of the abnormal nervous conditions which, in his opinion, lead many girls to go wrong, Dr. Colby said: "The remedy lies in the early education a good mother can give." Looking at the same pitiful question from another standpoint, Miss Mary Bartelme, head of Chicago's Court for Delinquent Girls, told a reporter from the Boston Herald, last year, that the majority of the girls who were brought before her were between fourteen and sixteen. "Almost invariably," said Miss Bartelme, "I find that the home environment of these children has been bad. When the home is bad, it must be a girl of sterling principle who remains good. There has been a great hue and cry raised recently that most girls go wrong because of inadequate wages. I do not believe this is true. Low wages, I think, drive comparatively few girls to the street."

It is startling to realize that the heedlessness, vanity, and social ambition of women are actually pandering to vice. But no thoughtful observer can doubt the fact. Speaking on "Commercialized Prostitution" in Brooklyn, last March, Mr. George J. Kneeland, of the Department of Investigation of the American Social Hygiene Association, enumerating the causes which swell the number of women in the profession each year, laid special emphasis on "the

increasing tendency toward immoral and suggestive amusements as a serious problem in American life." For this tendency, surely, the mothers rather than the fathers of the community are to blame. At the theatre, too, and at the fiction-counter, the lack of delicacy shown by women patrons is notorious.

That woman's vote would break up the "white-slave traffic," and go far toward curing the social evil, has been the strongest argument of the suffragists. And yet, at that very Tremont Temple meeting, last year, when their leader, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, exploited the unsavory subject so sensationally, Mr. Frederic H. Whitin, of the New York Committee of Fourteen, declared that "a happy home is the greatest preventive of the white slave traffic," and added, "The great problem, however, is to educate young women not to arouse men."

Last spring, before a fashionably attired New York audience of nearly one thousand, with an admission price of \$2, the same subject was again discussed by experts. "The attitude of women toward libertines, rakes and dissipants," says the reporter, "was handled without gloves by the speakers, and it was the opinion of those dealing with the subject that women themselves are largely to blame for the present situation. Clifford G. Roe, President of the American Bureau of Moral Education of Chicago, unhesitatingly told his audience (mostly women) that this was so."

Plain speaking, this is. The fact that many of the sociologists whose opinions have been quoted are themselves suffragists only makes their admissions more striking. The need of the day seems to be, not more "mothering" of the community, but better "mothering" of the individual child. This conclusion will be a welcome one to the multitudes of mothers who believe that they can serve the community better through the home than through the ballot-box.

MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS

1832-1914

THIS name will bring to many readers of THE REMONSTRANCE a vision of the brilliant woman whose presence was eagerly desired for occasions, whether grave or gay, by all who knew her. Her abundant life was manifestly the outcome of inherited character and talent, and a good education.

The first public recognition of her ability was her appointment to the Massachusetts State Board on Prisons, where her work showed such insight, efficiency and sympathy as to win a national reputation.

In 1883, Mrs. Homans began her long opposition to Woman Suffrage. She was prompted by Mr. George G. Crocker's request to friends to send a remonstrance to the Massachusetts Legislature, if they did not wish to vote at the next Municipal election. This was promptly done, and from that time a succession of protests followed the yearly Woman Suffrage petitions. But opposition, once started, did not halt here. Mrs. Homans was for twelve years the leader of a dozen women who met regularly at her home for study and discussion. She was also a prime mover in starting press work and a yearly address at the State House. It was her brother, Thornton K. Lothrop, who read Mrs. Clara T. Leonard's excellent letter in the Old Green Room in 1884. In that year Francis Parkman wrote his well-known paper for the North American Review. Other writers from '84 to '86 were Rev. O. B. Frothingham, Prof. W. W. Goodwin, Richard H. Dana, John Boyle O'Reilly. The State House Hearings were addressed by Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells, Mr. Crocker, Judge John Lowell, Rev. Brooke Herford, Arthur Lord and others. The yearly publication called THE REMONSTRANCE was begun in 1890, and it was changed to a Quarterly in 1908.

In the winter of 1895, Mrs. Homans resigned from the small Committee which had done such quiet but effective work, and left home with her daughter for a journey round the world. On her return in 1896, she at once joined the large Association which had been formed in her absence, and she was ever after a valued member of the Executive Committee and a Vice-President. She was frequently asked to speak at meetings of the Opposition, and fortunate were they who heard her. Her fine presence, rich smile and buoyant spirit charmed, and her keen wit added poignancy to her forcible statements. Her ideals were high, her instincts were strong for true womanhood, and behind them were convictions formed by study of history and of government, and of all that tended to the highest development of the modern woman. Her wide acquaintance with the best men and women of her time kept her in touch with the life of her day until her last year.

Mrs. Homans was generous to sincere believers in Woman Suffrage, as was shown by her continued friendship for Mrs. Julia Ward Howe.

The sympathy of friends and admirers followed her through her many sorrows, and they now rejoice that she has gone beyond the limitations of age, to enter the eternal youth of the Spirit.

—Mary L. Guild.

A NEW REASON FOR "VOTES FOR WOMEN"

To the Duchess of Marlborough, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont's daughter, is due the credit of discovering an entirely new reason for giving the ballot to women. During her recent visit to this country, in a widely-published interview, the Duchess said:

"We wealthy people are often asked why we want the ballot; but few realize the position occupied by

mothers-in-law to certain titled youths. Women of wealth whose daughters have married spendthrifts sorely need the opportunity to make laws to protect their fortunes from the sons-in-law whose chief aim is to spend aimlessly the money of mothers-in-law. These young spendthrifts need a curb and women will furnish it when they get the ballot."

It must be a hard heart which could fail to be moved by this appeal. It is true that woman suffrage involves revolutionary changes. In Great Britain, it would put the control of the Empire in the hands of women. But what does all this matter by comparison with the grievance of Duchesses who find their fortunes melting away through the recklessness of sons-in-law? True, there are cynical people, old-fashioned people, who would say that the real remedy lay farther back; and that it might be possible for mothers, even titled mothers, so to bring up their daughters that they would have no desire to marry young spendthrifts; and that such mothers might even go so far as to refuse to sanction such marriages.

But such reasoning as this is simply archaic. Nowadays, everything is to be done through legislation; and the ballot is the cure-all. The Duchess of Marlborough is not so definite as might be wished. She does not indicate precisely what form of a Law for the Regulation of Spendthrift Sons-in-law she would like to have enacted. But she feels sure that women would furnish a "curb" if they were given the ballot.

So we are given a new suffrage slogan: "Down with spendthrifts: Votes for Women."

A PREMIUM ON INEXPERIENCE

THE suffragists boast of the fact that they are "getting workers at an earlier age each year." They glory in ignoring experience and practical knowledge and in placing academic theories above common sense.—Mrs. Austin M. Purves, Vice-Chairman of Organizing Committee, Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

THE CAMPAIGN STATES

THERE are seven states in which proposed suffrage amendments will be submitted to the voters at the elections next month: Nevada, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Missouri and Ohio. In the first four, the amendment is submitted by the legislature; in the other three, through the initiative-referendum. In North Dakota, it is required that an amendment shall be approved by a majority of all the voters voting at the election; in the other states, all that is required is that the amendment shall be approved by a majority of the voters voting upon it. Nebraska requires that the majority must be at least 35 per cent of all the voters.

Provisions for constitutional amendment vary widely in the different states. The reason that the suffragists chose the initiative process in Nebraska is clear; for, in that state, a three-fifths vote of each house is required, if the legislature is to submit an amendment. The reason that the Illinois suffragists chose to push a partial-suffrage bill through the legislature by what they boast of as a secret lobby is also clear; for in that state a proposed amendment must receive a two-thirds vote in each house and, at the polls must be approved by a majority of the voters voting at the election, and, once defeated, cannot be submitted again for four years. Also in that state, only one amendment can be submitted at a time; so that any amending proposal is liable to be crowded aside by some competing proposal.

In Missouri, the signatures of only 8 per cent of the voters are required to put a proposed amendment upon the ballot. In almost any state, that proportion of signatures could be secured to almost any proposal; but the suffragists will find it quite a different matter to secure a majority vote at the polls, in a state which cast 699,210 votes in 1912.

In Ohio, the suffragists secured about 131,000 signatures to their pe-

tition for the submission of a suffrage amendment; and Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, President of the Ohio Equal Suffrage Association, affirms that this is "the biggest initiative petition ever presented to any state in any country in the whole world." This is an error. Three initiative petitions have been filed this year in Ohio, each with more signatures than the suffrage petition. The petition of the state board of commerce for the classification of property for taxation bore 140,000 signatures; that of the temperance forces asking for state-wide prohibition carried 175,000 names; and that of the so-called liberal forces for their "home rule and anti-prohibition" amendment, had 284,203 signatures. Two years ago, the voters of Ohio defeated a suffrage amendment by a majority of 87,455. There is no reason to believe that they have changed their views on the question.

It would be idle to make predictions so near an event; but in every one of these seven states, there is strong opposition to the suffrage amendment, and a good chance of its defeat.

BRITISH MILITANCY AND WHO PAYS FOR IT

THE annual report of Mrs. Pankhurst's organization, the Women's Social and Political Union, for the year ending February 28, 1914, is an interesting document, though not intended for general circulation. It defines the purposes of the organization, and gives the names of contributors to its funds and, in general terms and lump sums, the disbursements.

That the militants are in no lack of funds to carry on their warfare upon society is proved by the figures given in the report. They received no less than \$182,675 in gifts during the year, and had a balance of \$52,350 on hand at its close. As might be expected, many of the gifts are anonymous, but as many as 150 names are given of contributors of sums of \$50 and over, and these

names should furnish ample data for the proposed prosecution of contributors for lawless conspiracy. The largest single item was the money resulting from Mrs. Pankhurst's American tour, which amounted to \$18,420.

Very much as the McNamaras perfected a system of dynamiting buildings and bridges all over this country, paying so much per "job" to their agents, so not a few of the recent militant outrages,—the burning of churches, libraries and mansions—are the work, not of half-crazed enthusiasts, but of paid emissaries, both men and women. Items of \$35,000 for "salaries, staff and organizers," and of \$10,000 for "travelling" and of over \$15,000 on "general office and sundry expenses" conceal these disbursements.

As for the purposes of the Union, they are clearly proclaimed. The Report dwells upon "the extraordinary success of the W. S. P. U." which, it is said, "plays the largest and most effective part in the Suffrage movement, and apart from that, its brave example and the public interest it excites go far to vitalize all the other Suffrage organizations." "As the W. S. P. U." the Report goes on "is the means through which the vote will be won, its supporters concentrate upon its service, etc." The programme of the organization is thus outlined:

"While the Government are still the primary object of attack by the Suffragettes, the public also are finding that it is impossible to ignore the question of votes for women, and that a peaceful life becomes more and more impossible so long as women are voteless. Apart from such property loss as they may sustain in this as in other wars, civil and international, *the public are now receiving education in the Churches, in restaurants, in theatres and elsewhere. They cannot get out of the sound of votes for women.*"

So the campaign of organized crime and lawlessness went on; and American suffragists are entitled to whatever gratification may come from the fact that they contributed a little more than one-tenth of the funds needed to keep it going during the last year.

FOR THE RED CROSS

ON September first the Public Interests League of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association, the first organization in Boston to engage in relief work for the Red Cross Society, was officially designated by Miss Louisa P. Loring, the Massachusetts Red Cross Agent, as the state centre for the carrying on of this work.

Sewing machines were installed, and a call sent out through the Press for more volunteers, which met with a fine response. Nearly one hundred towns have sent in for material, instructions, and patterns, and sewing guilds and similar bodies have been formed for the purpose of making convalescent robes, pajamas, night shirts, sheets, and pillow cases. All these will be sent into the League headquarters for final inspection, counting, and marking. They will then be forwarded to the National Red Cross for shipping. These garments will go out as soon as arrangements are perfected.

Within the first fortnight, three thousand yards of material had been cut, seven sewing machines loaned, and from twelve to thirty women were reporting for duty daily.

The Warcham Branch held lawn parties and donated the proceeds to the Red Cross. The Dover Branch has sent in \$50 toward the general fund. The Framingham Branch has sent over \$100 and nearly \$300 in cash has been forwarded from League headquarters. All in addition to the large amount of material furnished.

On Tuesday, September 15, the workers were encouraged by a visit from Miss Loring, who brought with her Miss Mabel T. Boardman, the head of the Red Cross in America. Miss Boardman inspected the material and work already finished, expressing much pleasure at what had been accomplished. She gave a short but most interesting account of the work now in hand and voiced the hope that in addition to work for the soldiers something might be done

for the women and children, who are also in great and immediate need. This clothing must be new and packed separately, as it will be handled in a different way from the regular supplies.

Though so much has already been accomplished, money is still particularly needed for handkerchiefs, sponges, hand towels, bath towels, hair brushes and combs, rubber sheets, and ward slippers or "mules."

Communications addressed to Mrs. John Balch, Public Interests League, 685 Boylston Street, Boston, Tel. Bk. Bay 2288, will receive prompt attention.

MRS. JUDITH W. ANDREWS

THE death of Mrs. Judith W. Andrews on August 29 reminds the members of our Massachusetts Association of the remarkable career of this wonderful woman. Mrs. Andrews was one of the earliest associates of this organization, and for many years used every endeavor to save woman from the calamity of being forced into political life.

Throughout her life, Mrs. Andrews was active in all undertakings which have promoted the best development of women. At an age when most women have laid aside their active interests, this remarkable woman journeyed to India in the cause of the child widows whom Ramabai had befriended.

Known as "Dr. Hale's right-hand man," there was no cry which failed to reach her ears, no concern of woman which did not win her zealous interest. Yet most of her work was done in such quiet ways that the world saw only the result, and seldom realized the painstaking effort involved in creating that result.

Mrs. Andrews' knowledge of all sorts and conditions of women convinced her that woman suffrage would be detrimental to the real progress of her sex. Those who recall her reading of Edward Everett Hale's protest against woman suffrage at a State House Hearing

treasure the memory of her majestic presence and her beautiful voice.

Through long years of invalidism her interest in the work of the Association never faltered, and the hope of the younger women is that they may fulfil the obligation which they inherit from her noble life.

A. N. G.

THE ANTI-WAR PARADE

(Ethel L. Valentine in the Springfield Republican, Aug. 20, 1914.)

IN view of the parade proposed by women in New York city as a protest against "the blighting of European civilization" by the present war, one is led to ask why these same worthy women did not take such a stand sooner, but for a vastly different purpose. Would not a parade arranged as a protest against the acts of vandalism committed by their militant sisters in England have won for them more general sympathy and been far more to the point? Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch is quoted as saying: "Art galleries and libraries will be destroyed. America will have to carry the light." . . . But how about the historic buildings and art works destroyed by the militant suffragists in England? How many hundreds of thousands of dollars did the destruction wrought by them last year foot up to? Was ever a protest, vigorous or feeble, registered by the New York women in the form of a parade or any other public demonstration to express their disapproval of such destruction of works of art and buildings in England? The destruction of "art galleries and libraries" during the war is looked for and expected as one of the inevitable consequences of warfare, whereas the wanton destruction of buildings and works of art in Great Britain has been without warning and under cover of darkness of night.

LONDON newspapers report that, between January, 1913, and July, 1914, the English suffrage militants set fire or attempted to set fire to 146 public buildings, churches, houses and other structures; exploded or attempted to explode 43 bombs; and damaged public and private property to the value of \$1,920,000, not including works of art, the value of which cannot be estimated.

"EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK"

ONE of the commonest rallying cries of the suffragists is "equal pay for equal work" and one of their most familiar promises is that to give women the vote will improve the position of women wage-earners.

New South Wales, which suffragists are in the habit of citing as a sort of elysium secured through woman suffrage, affords an opportunity to test the validity of this claim. Woman suffrage was granted in New South Wales in 1902 and was first exercised in 1904. Yet, in 1911, after seven years of women's voting, the Royal Commission appointed to investigate labor conditions there, reported:

"Though the organization of women workers is proceeding, it is still true that for the most part women workers are unprotected, either by unions or by awards of industrial tribunals; and partly through the absence of such protection the wages paid in many grades of factory work done by women do not reach the level of an independent living wage."

Suffragists point with satisfaction to the minimum wage act of New South Wales. But they omit to mention the fact that it fixes the minimum wage at only *four shillings per week*. There are also Minimum Award Rates fixed under the Industrial Arbitration Act,—which was enacted in 1901, three years before women began voting. But, if there is any connection here between women's wages and women's votes it is not such as to give the suffragists unalloyed satisfaction. As regards tailors and tailoresses, for example, in 1900, before suffrage, the average weekly wages of tailors and tailoresses was separated by only 5s.—£2 3s. 3d. for men, and £1 18s. 3d. for women. Five years later, under suffrage, tailors' wages averaged £2 19s. and tailoresses' averaged £1 2s. 4d. The Minimum Award of 1910 fixed the men's wages at £2 15s. and the women's at only £1 8s.—or almost exactly one-half.

As regards teachers, it is true that, in the three lowest classes into which teachers are divided, the same minimum wage is fixed for men and women. But the effect of this attempted equality is a very great disproportion between men and women teachers in those classes. Where men and women command the same salaries, it is almost always the men who get the positions. Thus, in Class 7, there are 613 men to 256 women; in Class 6, there are 444 men to 33 women; in Class 5, there are 593 men to 21 women. An attempted equality which results in crowding women out of employment can hardly be regarded as an unalloyed boon. In the higher classes of teachers, where the minimum wage does not apply, the disproportion between the number of men and women teachers disappears.

It was only after severe public criticism that the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association abandoned its lottery expedients at its shop in Chicago. An incident which attracted unfavorable attention, early in August, was the hiding of a diamond ring in a mammoth cake, which was sold at \$1 a slice. Whoever bought the slice in which the ring was concealed carried off the ring. This seemed rather a questionable way of advancing a cause which professed to be in the interest of social and political uplift.

SUFFRAGISTS resent the statement that giving women the ballot doubles the cost of elections. One of them, in the New York Tribune of July 19, says: "Of course, the only extra expense is the additional number of ballots to be run on the presses." But what of the additional polling places required, the additional election judges and clerks? Freeport, Ill., is not a large place, but the Freeport Bulletin states that the polls were so congested at the last election that it will be necessary hereafter to have 28 polling pre-

cincts instead of 14; and to pay about \$1,000 for additional judges and clerks, and \$500 for extra booths, besides the additional expense for rent of polling places and for additional printing. In a great state like New York, the extra cost of women's voting would amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars. And, for all the doubling of time and energy and election cost, there is not a single compensation.

As the suffragists have so much to say about the social evil and the white slave traffic, as if these curses of society were sure to vanish when women have the vote, it is profitable to recall what so well-accredited a suffragist as Dr. Helen L. Sumner has to say about conditions in Colorado. In her book on "Equal Suffrage," pages 193 and 205, recording her investigations in that state, she says: "It is impossible to see that equal suffrage has had any effect upon the social evil"; and adds that "in Denver the social evil is more brazenly open and more extensive than in almost any other city in the United States" and that "women have in fact made little effort in this direction." She says further that "women's votes have about as much to do with this condition of affairs as a twelve-year-old child with the Constitution of the United States." So candid an admission as this serves as a useful corrective to the extravagant suffrage claims.

THE OVERTAXED HALF

(From the Louisville Post, July 17, 1914.)

MR. BRYAN thinks "his wife" is as well qualified as he, and more devoted than he to the welfare of their children. That is not to the point. The proposition is not to enfranchise Mrs. Bryan, but to enfranchise every woman in Nebraska, over the protest of a majority of women. It is to impose a new task on the overtaxed half of the human family. It doubles the franchise, but not by one iota does it alter the proportion between the good and the bad, the wise and the ignorant, the sane and the insane.

A SUFFRAGE "BLACK LIST"

THE National American Suffrage Association has published a "black list" of Senators and Representatives whose defeat it wishes to compass because of their opposition to suffrage.

The Association proudly says that "this is believed to be the first time in the history of the woman suffrage movement that women have resorted to a black list of those opposed to them." After the returns of next month's elections are all in, and it is seen how little this attempt to put anti-suffrage Congressmen under the ban has amounted to, the suffragists will be likely to speak of the enterprise less boastfully.

Nine Senators and nine Representatives are on the list. The Senators are Brandegee of Connecticut, Clarke of Arkansas, Dillingham of Vermont, Fletcher of Florida, Gore of Oklahoma, Root of New York, Shively of Indiana, Smith of Maryland and Lodge of Massachusetts. The Representatives are Underwood of Alabama, Mann of Illinois, Fitzgerald of New York, Page of North Carolina, Calloway of Texas, Garner of Texas, Garrett of Tennessee, Hay of Virginia and Sisson of Mississippi.

Not all of the members selected for attack are opposed to suffrage. Their crime, in the eyes of the suffrage blacklisters, is that they are opposed to forcing suffrage upon unwilling states through an amendment to the Federal Constitution. And for this offence, and this only, the suffragists want to defeat such Senators as Root and Lodge, Brandegee and Dillingham, and such Representatives as Underwood, the Democratic leader of the House, Fitzgerald, his lieutenant, and Mann, the Republican leader of the House, framer of the White Slave law,—a measure which has done more for the protection of women than all the rhetoric and sentiment of the suffrage leaders, from Mrs. Pankhurst down. Experienced politicians will notice with amusement that, of the

nine Representatives selected as victims, seven are from southern states, which have no sympathy at all with suffrage, still less when it is urged in violation of state rights.

This attack by the suffragists is welcome. It shows their temper; and later, it will show their powerlessness. THE REMONSTRANCE predicts that the blacklisted Senators and Representatives will gain rather than lose votes through the raising of this issue.

NORTH DAKOTA WOMEN DO NOT WANT THE VOTE

THE women of North Dakota, as well as those of Massachusetts, Connecticut and other eastern states, have shown conclusively, by their indifference to the school ballot, that they do not want full suffrage.

North Dakota women have had the school vote for twenty-five years. Yet not more than two or three per cent of the women entitled to vote avail themselves of the opportunity. Mrs. N. C. Young of Fargo, former head of the Women's Federation of the state, has gathered from official sources the vote cast at the primaries last June. Here are a few specimen counties:

Grand Forks county, men voting 2,800; women 95.

Cass county, men voting 3,598; women 31.

Walsh county, men voting 2,000; women 65.

Nelson county, men voting 1,404; women 73.

Pembina county, men voting 2,154; women 97.

Towner county, men voting 1,885; women 15.

The total vote of women in these counties was less than 3 per cent of the vote cast by the men.

The apathy of North Dakota women at school elections seems to be chronic. At the election for state superintendent of public instruction in 1900—one of the candidates being a woman—57,525 men voted, and only 9,327 women. At the similar election in 1904, with three candidates in the field, 67,918 men voted

and only 6,512 women. And in 1909, again with three candidates, 96,737 men voted and only 2,015 women, or about 2 per cent.

If the men of North Dakota reject the suffrage amendment next month, as they are likely to, they can feel that they are doing what the great majority of North Dakota women want them to.

CONFESSEDLY A MINORITY

At a suffrage meeting at Brookline, Aug. 1st, Mrs. Gertrude Newell, one of the speakers, was asked whether a majority of Massachusetts women really wanted votes. She replied that the question could not be definitely answered, but it was a fact that the majority of people were never in favor of reform measures.

That is a familiar phrase, borrowed from the Woman's Journal. But it carries the admission that the suffragists represent only a minority of women; and it carries also the assumption that the wishes of the minority should control. Other suffrage speakers go still farther. Mrs. M. S. Hathaway, for example, addressing a suffrage rally at Helena, Montana, July 25th, said:

"It makes no difference whether the majority of the women want to vote or not, if there is one woman in Montana who wants to vote, she should be given the right. If the others don't care to vote, why, it's their privilege to stay at home."

And "General" Rosalie Jones, the cross-country "hiker," speaking to a street crowd at Minneapolis, June 20th, said:

"If there were only one woman in Minnesota who needed the ballot for her protection, I believe that one woman should have it."

In other words, the caprice of a single woman is a sufficient reason for thrusting the ballot upon the great majority of women, who are opposed to it. If the time ever comes in this country when the rule of the minority is substituted for the rule of the majority that reasoning will hold.

HOW CHILDREN FARE IN SUFFRAGE STATES

If there is one particular more than another in which it ought to be possible to trace the good results of woman suffrage, it is the protection of children.

This is a subject which figures conspicuously in suffrage oratory. From every suffrage automobile, and from every suffrage soap-box at the street corner come impassioned appeals to give the ballot to women in order that children may be properly cared for. Pure milk for the babies, child sanitation, the protection of child purity, and laws restricting or forbidding child labor,—these are reforms, it is insisted, which wait for women's vote and cannot be looked for without it.

But what are the facts? There is one State in which boys of any age are allowed to engage in street trades at night,—selling papers, blacking shoes, tending stands, etc. In the same State, girls ten years of age or older have the same right. Is it some hardened man-suffrage State which thus exposes its boys and girls to the deadly perils of city streets at night? No: it is Colorado, where women have been voting for more than twenty years. What this laxity leads to is pointed out in the report of the National Child Labor Committee for November, 1913, which says:

"It is scarcely more perilous for girls than it is for boys to sell papers, peddle gum, guide beggars, black shoes and tend stands or engage in any other form of street trading. Not only do children who work thus out of school hours gradually fall behind in their studies and reach a limit of mental capacity lower than the promise of earlier years, but physically and morally they suffer positive harm."

Colorado is not the only suffrage state which fails to protect its children. In Washington,—for four years a suffrage state—any boy or girl, ten years old or over, is allowed to beg or peddle or sing on the street

for gain. Utah fixes an age limit of twelve years for boys and sixteen years for girls for selling papers on the streets; but it allows girls of twelve to act as public bootblacks.

Last year was one of almost nation-wide advance in the matter of child-labor legislation. Not less than thirty-two states enacted laws bearing on child labor. The two most conspicuous failures of the year were in suffrage states. The Uniform Child Labor Law was defeated in the Idaho legislature by a vote of 31 to 12. The Utah legislature defeated a bill which fixed an 18-year limit for extra-hazardous occupations.

Much has been said in praise of the provision of the Colorado law which makes a parent responsible for the delinquency of a child. But there are nineteen male-suffrage states which have similar laws, with this important difference, that in Colorado the obligation is not enforced until a boy gets into court as a delinquent, while in the male-suffrage states referred to, the parent is held responsible if the child is sent to work before he is of legal age. Moreover, Colorado does not require any proof of age beyond the affidavit of the parent or guardian, while in twenty-five male-suffrage states documentary proof in the form of birth or baptismal certificates is required. Among the states enumerated by the National Child Labor Committee as failing to require adequate proof, and thus opening the way to the employment of nine and ten year old boys under affidavits by their parents that they are fourteen or sixteen, are not less than four suffrage states,—Colorado, Idaho, Utah and Wyoming.

Miss Minnie Bronson, who reviews these and similar facts in her pamphlet on "Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation," reaches the conclusion that "the suffrage states, far from being in the van of remedial legislation for children, have been laggards in the work." This conclusion is abundantly just-

fied, and it should serve to moderate the extravagant claims of the suffragists. Tested by its fruits, suffrage has done little for the children.

NEVADA LEARNING FROM COLORADO

(From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Aug. 13, 1914.)

MRS. WENONAH PINKHAM of Colorado, is campaigning in Massachusetts in behalf of Woman Suffrage. Here is one of her statements:

"Nevada is a State without woman suffrage, surrounded by States where women have the vote; consequently in Nevada vice is rampant, having been driven from the other States by the women and taking refuge under the protection of the man-governed State."

The Gazette has not the honor of Mrs. Pinkham's acquaintance, but it enjoys and honors the acquaintance of many women who have come to Nevada from Colorado. These women are home-makers, not politicians. They have contributed to the morals and not to the vice of the State. They are of the type that Nevada welcomes and honors. They brought neither vice nor anarchy to Nevada, and they found less than they left behind.

Their experience in Colorado was sufficient. They saw it at work. Instead of commending it, they are warning the State against it. Many of them, among the best women in the land, are organized to oppose it; several are leaders in the organization. If Woman Suffrage in Nevada were left to those women of Nevada who came from Colorado, the proposed amendment would be defeated 5 to 1.

SUFFRAGE BAD MANNERS

(From the Milwaukee Free Press, July 5, 1914.)

THE suffragists who, in a representative gathering of their party, did not hesitate to hiss the former President of the United States, although Mr. Taft had consented to address them at their invitation, evinced the same conspicuous want of manners in their interviews with President Wilson. No group of men, however rough and unlettered, would have shown themselves so unmindful of the proprieties of the occasion as these women whose impertinence drew forth a rebuke from a patient and courteous chief magistrate.